HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 421815
S.F., CA. 94142-1815

11-4-95

HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Hal=

I had intended to write you just as soon as I returned from the "COPA" event but, unfortunately, I developed a cold which kept me from keeping up on things and from writing to you. I'm a lot better now but the cold did hamper my activities a bit.

I received your 3 letters & I'll respond to some of the question you asked me in them & then I'll give you my evaluation of the "COPA" conference plus I'll enclose a number of items which, of course, are yours to keep and I'll add whatever comments I can to the enclosed items.

First, let me answer some of the questions you asked in your letters=

(1) Joe Backes told you about my testimony to the ARRB last November 1994 & apparently told you that (to Tunheim I had discussed the caller to the 1966 KDIA show (of Dolan's) where he discussed the "crypto" thing. This is partly true= I was asked not by Tunheim but by Marwell to see if I would provide the name of the caller. I told Marwell that this whole aspect was "confidential" but that I'd discuss it with you, Hal, before releasing the name. But, again, it was

Marwell & not Tanheim who asked me for the name. You may recall that last year I sent you a hand-written copy of what I would speak on (in Dallas in 1994). Perhaps you had forgotten that I sent this to you. In any event, I've enclosed the official transcript of my testimony so you can look it over more thoroughly. It differs slightly from my hand-written talk & of course, included the questions asked me by Graf (he asked me "what is crypto" & he once did code work for the U.S. in World War II).

You'll recall our conversation when I visited you in Frederick on my trip. I gave you the name of the person I believed was the caller based on my looking into the matter. Well, I have news for you regarding the name. When I was on my trip to Washington, a woman friend of mine looked into the whole matter & based on her information I've now concluded that the name I thought it was & which I gave you (& my lady friend) cannot be the caller. Here's what happened - I had given the name to a woman friend of mine whom I trust absolutely with very confidential names or information. She is an avid reader of books, magazines, & newspapers. When I gave the name of this "caller" I told my lady friend that I had learned that the "caller" had died but if, by chance, she came across the name to let me know. She did come across the name! There was an article in a local newspaper mentioning that name & the article mentioned that the son of the alleged

"caller" was involved in some "cause". Using an alias, my lady friend called up pretending to be a friend of the "cause" in which the man was involved. My lady friend didn't speak to the man but to his wife. After some discussion of the "cause" my lady friend just point blank asked the wife if she knew of Oswald in any way. She said — no — she didn't. She (my lady friend) then asked if there was anyone in the family who knew Oswald & again the answer was — no. Finally she asked if her husband's father was in the Marine Corps & she, again, said — no — & that no member of the family was ever in the Marine Corps.

After all this I concluded that my choice for the caller was wrong (based it on a list of people attending a convention). Obviously my wrong choice doesn't mean the "caller" doesn't exist & he is still out there. Unless the wife is lying about the father being in the Marines (& I can see no reason for her doing this) it simply isn't the person I thought was the caller.

I know that when I gave you the name you said it sounded "familiar" but it appears I'm in error on the choice of the name — do you agree?

The only other thing I can think of is that since the caller maintained Oswald had "crypto" & there were only 5 such in the outfit, the caller could well be one of the 5. This would rule out, of course, both Oswald & Schrand but who are the other 3?? Is there a list or way of obtaining these 3 names & if I'm correct I can check on those names to see if any of the three lived in the Bay Area in 1966. Joe Nolan's program was not

a national radio show & was only heard in the Bay Area so the caller lived in this area. I could be wrong about the caller being one of the 5 but it occurred to me after I no longer concluded I had the right person's name & was in error. Do you think this a plausible way to proceed? Let me know.

(2) In one of your letters you cited a "USA today" story on John Newman on Carson Gayton. I don't recall the name though you said you did work on it in 1970, it could be in my files but I've no recollection of the name.

(3) In one of your letters you requested a copy of the letter I sent to "PUBLISHER'S WEEKLY" on why they didn't review "NEVER AGAIN!". I received no reply from them & I'm enclosing a copy of the letter I sent to them.

(4) In your most recent letter you asked me if I had any information to the effect that Mailer gave as one of his reasons for not showing up at the recent "COPA" was his fear that you'd be there to receive your award.

I have no information to that at all & I don't recall anything like that being discussed either by Aguilar (who gave the speech honoring you) nor by Walt Brown who provided details on his conversation with Mailer on the "rules" Mailer laid down before he would attend "COPA". Of course, Mailer could've told Brown this on the phone (Mailer being unwilling to be there when you received the award) but, if so only Brown could tell you. Brown told me at "COPA" that he became so exasperated at Mailer's "conditions" that he decided not to have Mailer come.

The previous (4) questions I've answered as best I can & now I'll discuss a few other points.

I note you said that Breo & Hosty are coming out with books on the JFK. I knew about Hosty but had no idea Breo was. Any idea on what he'll cover (undoubtedly the medical but anything else??).

And speaking of books there is Max Holland coming out with a book on the Warren Commission. Towards that end, I'm missing a copy of a November 1991 "American Heritage" article by Holland. I'm already drafting a letter in reply to the article and want to complete it as quickly as possible.

Again, mentioning articles - I'm working on a long article to appear in the "Bay Guardian" newspaper. It is an "alternative" style paper, far from radical, but I know the editor (he ~~used to~~ once offered me a job after seeing my Berkeley Barb articles) & he suggested I do something on the JFK case.

Here is my thinking on this. I'd like to do an article on the ARRB — a short history — its hearings (to include my testimony) — the criticism the ARRB has received not otherwise known of (& not appearing in the assassination journals). I would appreciate it if you could send me a statement on your reaction to how the ARRB has handled itself & particularly how it did (or didn't) react to what you ask they look into (I know, of course, from what you've written that they've done nothing). I will also mention in the Guardian article my frank analysis of what took place in "COPA" (Yes — there was a lot of ~~BULL~~

"Crazy" stuff being peddled by various speakers but there were moments which I thought were important (the best examples were Don Gibson (who, incidentally, agrees with your hypothesis of the Rostow-connection to the Warren Commission set-up) & Gene Case who did a brilliant analysis of the Z-film confirming the first shot tridmel & refers to your "blur analysis" approach. Case is a man you should know of (he may have already been in touch with you). You'll see the abstract he published in what I've enclosed. I've enclosed the whole abstract issue so you can look through it. To me the most important abstracts in these are (& you should read these before you read the others): Randy Robertson (various abstracts); The Snyders; GENE CASE; BRAD PARKER (various abstracts); Gary Aguilar, Don Gibson & also look at my abstract on "Oswald as a U.S. Intelligence Agent - the Evidence".

There are, of course, the usual crazy abstracts. I would cite here the John Armstrong (theory that Oswald developed as an agent from age 11); Lenty (that the Z-film was altered); Vince Palamara (Secret Service "involvement") & a few others I could cite but you'll see for yourself.

Finally, to close out this long letter I'll just mention a few points about the enclosures:

I've enclosed the press release copies which I picked up at the ARRB Hearings in Washington

on Monday October 23rd. I met the investigator ~~Ford~~ handling the photographic evidence for the ARRB. His name is David R. Montague. Keep that name in your file. He had a copy of the CECONE Dealey Plaza map which was given to him by a staff member of the ARRB to whom I sent a copy some time back.

I sat down with Montague & discussed who he should seek out. Groden was there & so was Joe Backes. Groden said Arnold ~~Rob~~ Rowland, Ed Hoffman & one other should be queried.

I suggested that the FBI agents in the Dallas field office at the time of the ass'n should be interviewed. I told Montague I'd send a list. I also told him that I had names of persons not on any listing who should be contacted. I also suggested the Paschall film be re-evaluated for anything on Barnett. I suggested that Ernie Brandt be contacted (he's the one I discovered in 1993) & can be seen in both the Z-film & Altgens. Brandt had a friend with him (Templin) who's never been interviewed & I suggested he be talked to.

Montague seemed eager & listened. I intend writing him very soon. If you have any ideas on this, let me know.

I'll close now but I want to mention one

last incident which occurred at CORA:

I had an opportunity to question Michael Baden (one of the panelists). Questions were on the form of ~~written~~ written card queries. I asked him: "In your experience or in the experience of anyone else you know, have you ever seen any evidence of damage done to a skull leaving 30 to 40 slivers or pieces of bullet fragments from a military-jacketed bullet?" His answer avoided the impact of why I asked that question & all he ~~said~~ said was = "We didn't have any experience with military jacketed bullets since we had no information on wounding ~~~~ taking place in military combat." (An HSCA staffer who was sitting in ~~front~~ front of me whom I know quite well, turned around to me & said "Hal — he didn't answer your question. There was a smile on the staffer's face as if to say & "We know why he couldn't answer because to answer would've shown that the HSCA version was a ridiculous position & they knew it).

Well, must get this in the mail!

Best,

Hal